Document 87

Filed 11/01/2007

Page 1 of 3

Case 5:07-cv-04330-RMW

RIVERPARK TOWER, SUITE 1650 333 WEST SAN CARLOS STREET SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA 95110-2740

MOUNT & STOELKER, P.C.

4

16

28

I,	Kevin	M.	Pasquinelli,	dec	lare	as	foll	ows:
----	-------	----	--------------	-----	------	----	------	------

- I am an attorney with the law firm of Mount & Stoelker, P.C., counsel for the 1. Defendants in this action, Romi Mayder, Wesley Mayder, Silicon Test Systems Inc., and Silicon Test Solutions LLC (collectively, "Defendants"). I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration and, if called upon to testify in this Court as to those facts, my testimony would be as stated herein.
- I submit this declaration in response to Defendants' Administrative Motion For Leave 2. To File Documents Under Seal dated October 2, 2007 as required by Northern California Local District Rule 79-5(d). L.R. 79-5(d) requires that when party submits a file under seal designated confidential by the opposing party, the "the designating party must file with the Court and serve a declaration establishing that the designated information is sealable, and must lodge and serve a narrowly tailored proposed sealing order, or must withdraw the designation of confidentiality."
 - I have reviewed the following materials: 3.
 - (a) The Declaration of Melina M. Morton in Support of Plaintiff's Motion to Compel:
 - Exhibit D: Defendant Silicon Test Systems, Inc.'s Response to Request for Production of Documents and Things (Set One)
 - Exhibit E: Defendant Romi Omar Mayder's Response to Request for ii. Production of Documents and Things (Set One)
 - Exhibit F: Document Production SITES001423 Emails between iii. Wesley Mayder and Romi Mayder.
 - Exhibit K: Email and Production of Documents iv.
- The above-identified materials each contain information that has been designated 4. "Confidential" or "Highly Confidential — Attorneys' Eyes Only" by Defendants under the Stipulated Protective Order.
- I have concluded that Defendants' confidentiality interest overcomes the right of 5. public access to the record, as a substantial probability exists that Defendants' overriding confidentiality interests will be prejudiced if the record does not remain sealed. The proposed sealing

28

MOUNT & STOELKER, P.C. RIVERPARK TOWER, SUITE 1650